

1 The opinion in support of the decision being entered today is *not* binding  
2 precedent of the Board

3  
4 UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

5  
6  
7 BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
8 AND INTERFERENCES  
9

10  
11 *Ex parte* RODGER WILLIAMS and KENNETH H. GENTRY, JR.  
12

13  
14 Appeal 2007-0764  
15 Application 09/840,469  
16 Technology Center 3600  
17

18  
19 Decided: July 26, 2007  
20

21  
22 *Before:* TERRY J. OWENS, MURRIEL E. CRAWFORD and HUBERT C.  
23 LORIN, *Administrative Patent Judges.*

24  
25 CRAWFORD, *Administrative Patent Judge.*  
26

27  
28 DECISION ON APPEAL  
29

30 STATEMENT OF CASE

31 Appellants appeal under 35 U.S.C. § 134 (2002) from a final rejection  
32 of claims 1, 4 to 9, 11 to 21, and 28 to 33. Claims 2 and 3 have been  
33 withdrawn from consideration and claims 10 and 22 to 27 have been  
34 canceled. We have jurisdiction under 35 U.S.C. § 6(b) (2002).

1 Appellants invented a system for providing a multiple browser  
2 interface which includes a display controller that runs the browser  
3 applications for each of a plurality of browsers. (Specification p. 2.)

4 Claim 1 under appeal reads as follows:

- 5 1. A system for providing a multiple browser interface  
6 comprising:  
7 a) a plurality of displays with associated input devices;  
8 and  
9 b) a display controller associated with said plurality of  
10 displays, said display controller comprising:  
11 i) communication electronics for communicating  
12 with a server running a control application; and  
13 ii) a control system associated with said  
14 communication electronics and adapted to:  
15 1) run browser applications for each of said  
16 plurality of displays;  
17 2) receive input from each of said associated  
18 input devices and provide the input to the control  
19 application; and  
20 3) receive instructions for said browser  
21 application from the control application; and  
22 wherein said display controller is further assigned  
23 one Internet Protocol (IP) address and each of the  
24 browser applications is assigned a unique port  
25 associated with the IP address.  
26

27 The Examiner rejected claims 1, 4 to 9, 11 to 21 and 28 to 33 under 35  
28 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Coppola in view of Devine and  
29 Kohut.  
30

The prior art relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting the claims on appeal is:

Kohut	US 6,338,008 B1	Jan. 8, 2002
Coppola	US 6,360,138 B1	Mar. 19, 2002
Devine	US 6,763,376 B1	Jul. 13, 2004

The Examiner reasons that Coppola discloses the invention as claimed, except that Coppola does not disclose an integrated customer interface system with a single display controller running a plurality of displays. The Examiner relies on Devine for teaching a single display controller for running a plurality of displays. The Examiner finds that the Frame NAT (Network Address Translator)/Router depicted in Figure 2 of Devine is a display controller running a plurality of displays.

Appellants contend that Devine does not disclose or suggest a display controller which runs browser applications for each of a plurality of displays and which has an assigned Internet Protocol (IP) address with each of the browser applications having a unique port associated with the IP address.

## ISSUES

Have Appellants shown that the Examiner erred in finding that Devine discloses a display controller which runs browser applications for each of a plurality of displays and which has an assigned IP address with each of the browser applications having a unique port associated with the IP address?

FINDINGS OF FACT

Appellants invented a system for providing a multiple browser interface that includes a display controller which runs the browser applications for respective browser displays (Specification p. 7). The display controller ensures that requests for web content are associated with the proper browser display and directs web content to the proper browser display upon receipt from the server (Specification p. 7). The display controller is able to recognize user input from each browser display and determine the particular browser display from which the input came (Specification p. 11). The display controller has a unique IP address and each of the browser applications has a port within the display controller IP address (Specification p. 14).

Devine discloses an integrated customer interface system for communications network management which includes a Frame NAT/Router that connects the customer to the public Internet or the Starbucks web server (col. 8, ll. 39 to 48). Devine does not disclose that the Frame NAT/Router is a display controller that runs browser applications. In addition, Devine does not disclose that the Frame NAT/Router has an assigned IP address or that each of the browser applications has a unique port associated with the IP address.

DISCUSSION

The Examiner has a duty of supplying a factual basis for an obviousness rejection. *In re Warner*, 379 F.2d 1011, 1017, 154 USPQ 173, 178 (CCPA 1967). The Examiner's conclusion of obviousness in this case

1 lacks factual support for the determination that Devine discloses a display  
2 controller that runs browser applications and has an IP address with each of  
3 the browser applications having a unique port associated with the IP address.  
4 Devine discloses only that the NAT/Router connects the customer to the  
5 public Internet or the Starbucks server. In addition, the IP address of the  
6 NAT/Router and the relationship to the associated browsers is not disclosed.  
7 The foregoing flaw in the Examiner's evidentiary showing finds no cure in  
8 the Kohut reference. Accordingly, we shall not sustain the rejection of claim  
9 1 and claims 4 to 9, 11 and 12 dependent thereon. Independent claims 13,  
10 14, and 20 contain language similar to claim 1 in regard to the display  
11 controller. These claims recite a display controller or multiple browser  
12 controller which runs browser applications and has a unique IP address. The  
13 claims also require that the browser applications have ports associated with  
14 the IP address. Therefore, we will not sustain the rejection as to claims 13,  
15 14, and 20 and claims 15 to 19, 21, and 28 to 33 dependent thereon.

• Appeal 2007-0764  
Application 09/840,469

1 DECISION

2 The decision of the Examiner is reversed.

3  
4 REVERSED

5  
6  
7 jlb

8  
9 Withrow & Terranova, P.L.L.C.

10 100 Regency Forest Drive

11 Suite 160

12 Cary, NC 27518